

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEAVON PIERCE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-06051-EMC](#)


**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

Docket No. 9

Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration of the order of dismissal and judgment filed on May 16, 2016. A party may move to alter or amend a judgment in a motion filed no later than 28 days after entry of judgment. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). A motion for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) ““should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed *clear error*, or if there is an intervening change in the law.”” *McDowell v. Calderon*, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 (9th Cir. 1999) (citation omitted) (en banc). Plaintiff has not shown newly discovered evidence, clear error by the Court, or an intervening change in the law. The order of dismissal correctly determined that the complaint did not state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the three newspapers Plaintiff had sued. His motion for reconsideration therefore is **DENIED**. (Docket No. 9.)

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 21, 2016



EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge